

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action of October 31, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and this paper is Applicants' response thereto. Claims 1-4, 7-8, 10, 12-15 and 17-25 are pending in this application. Claims 5-6, 9, 11 and 16 are cancelled. Claims 21-25 are new. Claims 1-5, 12, 14 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,579,037 to Tahara *et al.* ("Tahara"). Claims 6-11, 12, 15-16 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tahara in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,064,858 to Iwai *et al.* ("Iwai"). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### **Amended Claims**

Claims 1, 3-4, 7, 10, 12, 14-15, 17 and 19-20 are amended by this paper. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the intended scope and to recite the feature "receiving circuitry configured to receive the display indicia in a wireless manner." Support for this is at least found in the specification as filed, pg. 10, ln. 2-22. Claim 1 was further amended to recite the feature "wherein the user display screen manager is adapted to sequentially display portions of the part of the received display indicia visually displayed in the first screen portion of the display in the second screen portion of the display." Support for this is inherent in the claims as filed and in addition, further support is provided in the specification as filed, pg. 12, ln. 17 – pg. 13, ln. 18. Thus, no new matter was added.

Claim 3 was amended to recite a feature previously recited in claim 4. Thus, no new matter was added.

Claim 4 was amended to recite "wherein said user display screen manager is adapted to provide a visual indication of the portion of the first part that is being displayed in the second portion of the display in the first portion of the display" and support for this is at least found in the specification as filed, pg. 13, ln. 7-18. Thus, no new matter was added.

Claim 7 was amended to recite "wherein the text data comprises a sequence of textual characters that comprises at least two words and wherein said user display screen manager is adapted to display less than all of the at least two words in the second portion of the display." As a subset of a plurality of textual characters could represent a word and the subset displayed in the second screen portion would not be all the characters displayed in the first screen portion, support for this amendment was inherent in the claim as filed, thus no new matter was added.

Claim 10 was amended to clarify the intended scope and to correspond to the cancelling of claim 8 and to correspond to the amendments made to claim 1, thus no new matter was added.

Claim 12 was amended to clarify the intended scope and to better correspond to the amendments made in claim 1, thus no new matter was added.

Claim 14 was amended to recite “wherein said user display screen manager is configured to be responsive to the actuation of the user actuator so that subsequent portions of the display indicia are displayed in response to use actuation of the user actuator” so as to clarify the intended scope. Support for this amendment was inherent in claim as filed, as well as the specification filed, pg. 7, ln. 3-8. Thus, no new matter was added.

Claim 15 was amended to correspond to the amendment to claim 1. Thus, no new matter was added.

Claim 17 was amended to clarify the intended scope and to additionally recite the step of “receiving a message including display indicia,” the step of “selecting a second portion of the first part of the display indicia to be displayed in the second screen portion” and the step of “displaying the second portion of the first part at the second screen portion in the second size.” Support for this amendment is at least found in the specification as filed on pg. 12, ln. 6 – pg. 13, ln. 7, as well as on pg. 13, ln. 8-18. Thus, no new matter was added.

Claims 19 and 20 were amended to clarify the intended scope and to better correspond to the amendments in claim 17. Thus, these claims inherently support the amendments and no new matter was added.

#### **New Claims**

Claims 21-25 are new and find support at least in the specification as filed, pg. 12, ln. 1 – pg. 13, ln. 18. Thus, no new matter was added. As the references of record fail to disclose the recited method, these claims are believed to be in allowable condition and notification of same is respectfully requested.

#### **Cancelled Claims**

Claims 5-6, 9, 11 and 16 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and Applicants reserve the right to file similar claims in a continuation application. The cancelling of these claims renders the rejection of same moot.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and §103**

Claims 1-20 were rejected in view of Tahara, alone or in combination with Iwai under § 102 or §103, respectively. Claims 1 and 17 are independent.

Claim 1 recites the features of “receiving circuitry configured to receive the display indicia in a wireless manner” and “wherein the user display screen manager is adapted to sequentially display portions of the part of the received display indicia visually displayed in the first screen portion of the display in the second screen portion of the display.” While not agreeing with the interpretation provided in the Office Action, even under the proposed interpretation there no mention of either of the above features. Rather, Tahara is directed toward providing the user with a means for selecting characters such as Japanese kanji characters. Thus, Tahara fails to disclose all the features of claim 1 and cannot be said to anticipate claim 1 for at least this reason.

Iwai is directed toward a method of providing an enlarged print preview view and simply makes no mention of the above features of claim 1. Thus, the combination of Tahara and Iwai cannot be said to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable in view of the references of record.

Claims 2-4, 7-8, 10 and 12-15 depend from claim 1. Therefore, these claims are patentable over the references of record for at least the reason claim 1 is patentable and for the additional features recited therein.

Claim 17 now recites the features of “receiving a message including display indicia” and “selecting a second portion of the first part of the display indicia to be displayed in the second screen portion” as well as the feature of “displaying the second portion of the first part at the second screen portion in the second size.” Applicants have been unable to locate any mention of these features in the references of record. Accordingly, the references of record fail to support an anticipation rejection or a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 17. Therefore, claim 17 is patentable over the references of record.

Claims 18-20 depend from claim 17. Therefore, these claims are patentable over the references of record for at least the reason claim 17 is patentable and for the additional features recited therein.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these grounds of rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

As all rejections have been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Please feel free to contact the undersigned should any questions arise with respect to this case that may be addressed by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 31, 2007

By: /Stephen L. Sheldon/

Stephen L. Sheldon  
Registration No. 58,732

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
10 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 3000  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312-463-5000  
Facsimile: 312-463-5001